



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 21, 2004

Ms. Veronica Ocañas
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469

OR2004-5044

Dear Ms. Ocañas:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 203773.

The Animal Care Services Division of the City of Corpus Christi (the "division") received a request for "any complaint against or including [the requestor], and a copy of the conference notes" related to a specified meeting. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108 provides in part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;

(2) it is information that the deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication;

....

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution;

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication; or

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (2), (b)(1), (2). Generally speaking, sections 552.108(a)(1) and 552.108(b)(1) are mutually exclusive of sections 552.108(a)(2) and 552.108(b)(2). Section 552.108(a)(1) protects information, the release of which would interfere with a particular pending criminal investigation or prosecution, while section 552.108(b)(1) encompasses internal law enforcement and prosecution records, the release of which would interfere with on-going law enforcement and prosecution efforts in general. In contrast, sections 552.108(a)(2) and (b)(2) protect information that relates to a concluded criminal investigation or prosecution that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. We note that a governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information that the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986).

You have not demonstrated that the division is a law enforcement agency. *See* Open Records Decision No. 199 (1978) (agency whose function is essentially regulatory in nature is not "law enforcement agency" for purposes of statutory predecessor to section 552.108). By its terms, section 552.108 applies only to a law enforcement agency or a prosecutor. This office has determined, however, that where an incident involving alleged criminal conduct is still under active investigation or prosecution, section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information that relates to the incident. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 372 (1983). Where a non-law enforcement agency has custody of information relating to a pending case of a law enforcement agency, the agency having custody of the information may withhold the information under section 552.108 if the agency demonstrates that the information relates to the pending case and provides this office with a representation from the law enforcement entity that the law enforcement entity wishes to withhold the information.

In this case, we find that the division has failed to demonstrate that the information at issue relates to a pending criminal investigation under section 552.108. *See Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W. 2d 519, 526 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (section 552.108 not applicable

where no criminal investigation or prosecution of police officer resulted from investigation of allegation of sexual harassment). Furthermore, you have not provided this office with a representation from any law enforcement entity that wishes to withhold the information. We therefore determine that the division may not withhold any of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.108 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976).

In *Morales v. Ellen*, the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation into allegations of sexual harassment. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the accused individual responding to the allegations, and the conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *See id.* The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held that "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.*

When there is an adequate summary of a sexual harassment investigation, the summary must be released along with the statement of the accused, but the identities of the victims and witnesses must be redacted and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of witnesses and victims must still be redacted from the statements. In either case, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. We further note that common-law privacy does not protect information about a public employee's alleged misconduct on the job or complaints made about a public employee's job performance. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 (1983), 230 (1979), 219 (1978).*

We find that the submitted document does not include an adequate summary of the investigation. Therefore, you must release all of the submitted information, except for the marked information that identifies the victims of sexual harassment. That information must

be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*. The remaining information is not protected by common-law privacy and must be released.¹

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

¹ We note that the records to be released contain information relating to the requestor that the division might be required to withhold from the public under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, as the subject of this information, the requestor has a special right of access to it. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates, or that person's representative, solely on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles). Therefore, if the division receives a future request for this information from an individual other than the requestor or his representative, the division should again seek our decision.

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Debbie K. Lee
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DKL/seg

Ref: ID# 203773

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Javier S. Zapata
3632 Glenway
Corpus Christi, Texas 78415
(w/o enclosures)